

Court

Kurt Tay, 43, gets 14 months & 10 days' jail for distributing sexual content on Telegram

He pleaded guilty.



Gawain Pek | ⌚ April 22, 2026, 04:59 PM

 Add as a preferred source on Google



Join Mothership's Telegram channel

Join Mothership's WhatsApp channel



Telegram and one charge under the Protection from Harassment Act.

The Deputy Public Prosecutor applied to proceed with the first charge pertaining to the non-consensual distribution of intimate images and the POHA charge, with the rest of the nine charges taken into consideration during sentencing.

Tay pleaded guilty to the charges.

A gag order was imposed on the identity of the victim.

Charges

Tay was accused of sending images and recordings of a woman engaging in sexual acts to a Telegram chat group on Oct. 27, 2023.

Charge sheets stated that Tay did so without the women's consent and knew that the distribution would likely cause the victim humiliation.

The victim cannot be named due to a gag order.

Any person found guilty of distributing or threatening to distribute an intimate image or recording without consent is liable to a prison term which may extend to five years, caning, a fine, or a combination of such punishments.

Tay was also charged under the Protection from Harassment Act for making threatening communication in a Telegram group chat on Oct. 18, 2023.

According to charge sheets, Tay had sent messages such as, "How much 2 hired killer".

For this, he could have been handed a fine not exceeding S\$5,000.

Tay was first charged in court on Nov. 1, 2023, and returned to court on Nov. 16 that same year.

—

Tay arrived at the state courts, flanked by his representatives.

Members of the public filled almost three rows of seats in the courtroom during the Apr. 22 hearing.

Some were heard discussing and deriding Tay.

Before the hearing commenced, Tay and his legal representatives stepped outside of the courtroom twice.

He was represented by public defenders.

After returning the first time, Tay was seen sitting in the corner, solemnly as he inspected court documents on a tablet.

Meeting the victim

Laying out the prosecution's case, Deputy Public Prosecutor (DPP) Dan Pan told the court that Tay engaged the victim after seeing her content on Twitter, now known as X.

The victim then told Tay to perform and record himself performing degrading acts, such as eating his own faeces and masturbating with his faeces.

At some point during their interaction, Tay informed the victim that one of his videos had been leaked, in which one of his tattoos was partially visible.

The victim denied leaking the video, claimed she lost her phone and threatened to send the videos to Tay's wife.

Tay had earlier told the victim that his wife was depressed and would be upset if she found out about their interactions.

act with a man.

The victim was identifiable in the recording and image, the DPP told the court.

Tay allegedly approached the victim about the recording and image, to which the victim dismissed as a "joke", the DPP said.

On Sep. 7, Tay asked for an "in-person session" with the victim, and the two got into a disagreement.

The victim threatened to make Tay lose his job.

Tay later alleged that compromising videos and photos of him were sent to his wife and in a messaging group chat.

On Oct. 18, 2023, Tay reportedly posted threatening messages, such as "How much to hire killer", in a group chat with 247 members.

This group chat was purportedly for fans of Tay.

According to the DPP, the victim's friends who were in the group identified the subject of Tay's messages as the victim and informed her about it.

On the morning of Oct. 27, Tay allegedly sent an intimate recording and image of the victim multiple times to a group chat.

The DPP also said that the messages Tay sent could easily be forwarded by any one of the 247 members.

Prosecution sought 16 months' jail

Delivering the verdict, District Judge Lee Lit Cheng found Tay guilty of the charges.

Relating to the POHA charge, the DPP sought a fine of S\$4,000, arguing that the threatening communications Tay made were "serious" and were "effectively a public declaration" of his desire for wanting the victim dead.

For the offence relating to non-consensual distribution of intimate images, the DPP sought 16 months' imprisonment.

ADVERTISEMENT

The DPP argued Tay's actions had caused a "high degree" of harm.

also pointed out.

There was also widespread distribution of the recording and image, reiterating that Tay had sent them multiple times.

He had also left them in the group chat without deleting them for some time.

On intent, the DPP said the fact that Tay sent the files multiple times showed that he intended to cause the victim "significant, if not [maximum] humiliation".

He also said that Tay had acted out of "malice" and for the "purpose of revenge".

ADVERTISEMENT

The DPP referenced during his sentencing submission a previous high court case, which serves as a sentencing framework for offences related to the distribution of intimate images and recordings.

Considering that Tay had pleaded guilty, the prosecution sought 16 months' jail for the charge relating to the non-consensual distribution of an intimate image and recording.

Despite this, the recordings were distributed.

He also pointed out the victim had herself said she was motivated by "trolling" Tay.

ADVERTISEMENT

The defence counsel also zeroed in on the fact that the victim had also made threats against Tay, such as saying she could cause Tay to lose his job and family.

"The [victim's] behaviour suggests that the degree of alarm caused to her must be attenuated to some degree," the defence counsel remarked.

The victim's behaviour, he continued, was not consistent with "a high degree of alarm".

Taken together, a S\$2,000 fine relating to the POHA charge would "suffice", the defence counsel argued.

Moving on to non-consensual intimate image distribution, the defence noted that the recording was six seconds long and at 240p resolution.

ADVERTISEMENT

The defence argued that the relationship dynamic between Tay and the victim puts Tay in a position that was more susceptible to being manipulated.

He also countered that there was no "calculated malice [for] personal gain" on Tay's part, and that he had acted out of "anger and frustration" instead.

The defence also highlighted that the victim did not react adversely to the fact that Tay had intimate recordings of her and instead brushed it off when he informed her about it.

The defence also disagreed with the characterisation that Tay had set out to "maximise humiliation".

The repeated threats against him and the circulation of his own videos resulted in Tay's actions, which are akin to someone "shouting or venting".

"Tay is not seeking to excuse his behaviour," his lawyer said, adding that Tay "regrets" his behaviour.

The counsel continued that Tay is ready to face the "lengthy imprisonment" and had quit his job, which will result in the loss of income for his family.

Relating to the referenced high court case, the defence argued that Tay's case was lower in degree in terms of harm and culpability

On these grounds, the defence sought 10 months' imprisonment.

"This is his first time in court in his 43 years of life," the defence submitted.

Judge

District Judge Lee Lit Cheng queried both the DPP and defence about the nature of the group chat in which the victim's image and recording were distributed.

The DPP purported, based on the group chat's title, that members of the group chat were Tay's "fans", but said that he is unable to confirm this.

The defence characterised the group chat members as people "who have an interest in Tay's life" and that they joined the group chat for "entertainment".

Delivering the sentence, Lee noted that there is "clear potential" for the victim's intimate image and recording to be distributed outside of the group chat.

She also noted that the victim had experienced alarm due to being identifiable in the intimate footage.

On culpability, the judge found that Tay did indeed act out of malice.

Tay was handed 14 months' imprisonment and a fine of S\$3,000.

As Tay is unable to pay the fine, he will serve 10 days in prison in lieu of paying the fine.

Tay will begin his sentence today.

Related story